1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :
4	v. : Criminal No. 1:18-cr-21
5	MARK BRETZ :
6	
7	
8	Transcript of proceedings on October 7, 2019, United States District Court, Erie, Pennsylvania, before
9	District Judge David S. Cercone.
10	
11	
12	
13	APPEARANCES:
14	For the Government: U.S. Attorney's Office Christian A. Trabold, Esquire
15	U.S. Courthouse 17 South Park Row, Room A320
16	Erie, PA 16501
17	For the Defendant: Federal Public Defender Andrew Lipson, Esquire
18	1001 Liberty Avenue Suite 1500
19	Pittsburgh, PA 15222
20	Court Reporter: Janis L. Ferguson, RPR, CRR 17 South Park Row
21	Room A340 Erie, PA 16501
22	
23	
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;
25	transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 2:05 p.m. 3 (In open court, Defendant present with counsel.) 4 THE COURT: The court is convened in the case of 5 United States versus Mark Bretz, at Criminal No. 18-21 of the 6 Court's criminal docket in the United States District Court, 7 Western District of Pennsylvania, Erie Division. This is the 8 time set for sentencing. 9 Mr. Lipson, have you and your client had an 10 opportunity to review the presentence investigation report and 11 the addendum attached to it? 12 MR. LIPSON: We have, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Other than matters that you've put in 14 your sentencing memorandum, do you have any additions, 15 corrections, or modifications to the presentence investigation 16 report? 17 MR. LIPSON: No, Your Honor, not at this time. 18 THE COURT: Does the Government? 19 MR. TRABOLD: No, sir. 20 THE COURT: All right, then. 21 Then the findings and the proposed guideline 22 calculations in the presentence investigation report and the 23 addendum are now adopted as the Court's final findings in 24 quideline calculations. 25 Before we proceed further, I do need to see counsel

```
at the Defendant at side-bar.
 1
 2
               (Side-bar conference held.)
               (Side-bar conference concluded.)
 3
 4
               THE COURT: Before sentence is imposed, the Court
 5
     invites counsel to make argument and invites the Defendant to
     exercise his right of allocution.
 6
 7
                    Mr. Lipson, we'll begin with you, please.
 8
               MR. LIPSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
 9
                    Your Honor, I would like to note for the Court
10
     that members of Mr. Bretz's family are here to show their
11
     support for Mr. Bretz. In particular, Mr. Bretz's sister,
12
     Carla Bretz; his parents, Mark and Kristy Bretz are here; as
13
     well as his uncle, Gary Straneva, all here to show support for
14
    my client.
15
                    Your Honor, this is a difficult case.
16
     guidelines are 121 months to 151 months, and that's based
17
     largely on the receipt of child pornography guideline at
     2G2.2.
18
19
                    Your Honor, Mr. Bretz comes before the Court
20
     asking that a sentence of 90 months would represent a sentence
2.1
     that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary in this
22
     case for several reasons.
23
                    But, Your Honor, this is the first serious
24
     offense in my client's life. He has never served a
25
     substantial period of incarceration in his life prior to this
```

case. And he has been in custody for 15 and a half months already at Erie County Prison awaiting sentencing in this case.

Your Honor, the Government's sentencing memo details the circumstances of the criminal conduct that my client engaged in, but I think it is important to note that on the day that investigators executed a search warrant at his home here in Erie, Pennsylvania, he candidly spoke with those agents, he waived his Miranda rights against self-incrimination, and explained not only the nature of what he did that was in violation of federal law, but, also, the extent of it.

And consistent with that admission and that remorse that he expressed to the investigating agents in this case, he has pleaded guilty to all four counts charged by the Government and is accepting of the Court's judgment in this case.

Your Honor, a sentence, though, of 90 months, which represents a two-and-a-half-year variance from the low end of the guidelines, is appropriate in this case for the following reasons:

First, the probation office correctly calculated his offense scores -- or, sorry, his criminal history score at a total of seven points, which places him into Criminal History Category 4. Their calculation is

technically correct, Your Honor, but I believe, given the circumstances of those crimes that he committed as a younger man and the sentence that he received, demonstrate that his score of seven and his placement in Criminal History Category 4 substantially overrepresents the seriousness of his criminal history.

Your Honor, the seven points that he gets for his criminal history come down to three separate convictions, which are reflected at Paragraphs 67, 68, and 69 of the final presentence report.

The first two offenses at Paragraph 67 and 68 assign a total of five points for two separate petty theft shoplifting convictions that he sustained; the first one at age 18, and the second one, Your Honor, at age 20.

At age 18, he was caught shoplifting a small digital MP3 player from Sears. And for that case, he received a total of, Your Honor, a — he received a probationary sentence from the Court of Common Pleas here in Erie, Your Honor, but because he was caught smoking marijuana on a couple occasions and because of his shoplifting offense at what became this conviction at Paragraph 68, his term of probation was revoked, and he was given an incarceratory sentence of approximately — give me one moment, Your Honor — of four to 12 months incarceration.

Because of that, the probation office correctly

counts that as a two-point conviction. But given the fact that that is a petty shoplifting offense for which he originally got probation, and that his drug use and marijuana, Your Honor, nothing alleged more serious than that -- although that was a violation of the terms of his probation -- and his conviction at Paragraph 68, it got converted, Your Honor, from a one-point conviction to a two-point conviction, Your Honor.

And so I would ask the Court to -- given the circumstances of that offense, to vary downward one criminal history point for that conviction.

For the conviction at Paragraph 68, Your Honor, this was another very similar shoplifting offense. There, he was charged and convicted of shoplifting an accessory to a video game console, Your Honor. That — and the Court gave a very uncommon sentence there; a sentence of one to 20 months incarceration. He served a total of 30 days incarceration on that offense, but because the maximum penalty was 20 months for that conviction, the probation office correctly notes that the guidelines treat that as a three-point conviction.

Your Honor, I think given the circumstances of that case and the sentence that he received and what he ultimately served there, that instead of three points, the Court should vary down and find that that is really a -- in some sum and substance, Your Honor, a conviction that smacks of a one-point penalty under what the guidelines truly

want to -- typically contemplate.

And, lastly, Your Honor, the third conviction that contributes to the seven points is a two-point conviction for disorderly conduct for failure to comply with a police officer. That occurred when my client was 23 years old in 2014.

Apparently, Mr. Bretz was having an argument with his girlfriend at the time. Police were dispatched, I believe because a neighbor called, and the police officers found Mr. Bretz's girlfriend at the time locked out of the home.

Mr. Bretz had some choice words for the police officers, and instead of treating it like a domestic argument, they charged Mr. Bretz with a disorderly conduct. He received a two- to four-month sentence, ultimately serving three months there, Your Honor. And that is a two-point conviction as well.

I think given the nature of those three convictions, receiving a total of seven points and being in Category 4 -- when I think of a Category 4 client of mine, Your Honor, their criminal history just looks substantially different than that Mr. Bretz has. And given the way points have been assigned in this case, I asked the Court to vary down four criminal history points to three, essentially saying one point would be sufficient for each of those convictions at

Paragraphs 68 to 69. And that would place Mr. Bertz in Criminal History Category 2 instead of Category 4.

The effect that that would have on the guideline calculation — and I understand that I'm asking this in terms of a variance under Section 3553(a) and not a formal departure. But the effect would be to change his advisory guideline range from 121 to 151 months, Your Honor, to 97 to 121 months.

And I believe that given that the offense score is as high as it is because of the way Section 2G2.2 treats child pornography offenses, that what criminal history category an individual finds them in has the effect of drastically increasing their advisory guideline range.

Here, that effect, Your Honor, is two years on the low end and two and a half years on the high end. And I believe that a variance, in light of the nature of my client's criminal history, is warranted here for that reason.

Now, Your Honor, the second reason that I believe a 90-month term of incarceration is sufficient, but not greater than necessary is -- which I just touched on, is the way that the sentencing guidelines treat child pornography offenses; essentially, responding to Congress to ratchet up offense scores based on conduct that is nearly ubiquitous in all of these cases.

In particular, the variance that I'm asking the

Court to adopt today is just one of those several enhancements under Section 2G2.2, Subsection (B). That is the use of the computer, Your Honor.

As I stated in my sentencing memo, Your Honor, use of computer is -- I didn't include the statistic in the sentencing memo, Your Honor. But as the Court is very well aware, these cases are essentially computer offenses. Perhaps when child pornography was -- in possession and other actions with respect to child pornography was criminalized by Congress, that was back in the '90s, Your Honor, and the Internet had not pervaded our culture or society to the extent it has now. And what we see is, with respect to child pornography, these are Internet crimes.

And so when a computer is used in over 95 percent in all of these cases, an enhancement based on the use of computer fails to, I guess, distinguish between those defendants which are more or less culpable. And I think Courts within this district have routinely found that the use of computer enhancement, those two points really do not bear on a defendant's culpability in a given child pornography case.

For that reason, Your Honor, Mr. Bretz has asked the Court to vary down in the two points on his offense score. Your Honor, such a variance, when coupled with the request for the Court to recognize the overrepresentation

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of his criminal history in this case, would bring him from a -- what I had said last, with my last argument, that a 97to 121-month advisory quideline range would bring Mr. Bretz to 78 to 97 months. Your Honor, what I am proposing as a sentence of 90 months would represent a sentence that is in the upper end -- the upper half of that revised advisory quideline range. And I think that that -- the Court, in light of Mr. Bretz's, I would say, non-serious, non-substantial, and overly calculated criminal history and the use of computer, that the Court has a valid basis to make that variance. Lastly, Your Honor, the PSR makes clear that my client is a troubled young man; that from a early young age he has been diagnosed as suffering from very serious mental health issues. In particular, he has been diagnosed with bipolar disorder, substance abuse dependence, and he has a family history of depression. As a result of this, Your Honor, throughout his teenage years and early 20's, my client has been prescribed a myriad of powerful psychotropic medications, including Depakote, which is spelled D-E-P-A-K-O-T-E; Seroquel, S-E-R-O-Q-U-E-L; Wellbutrin, W-E-L-L-B-U-T-R-I-N; Zoloft; and Risperdal, R-I-S-P-E-R-D-A-L, not to mention Ritalin and Adderall for, you know, attention deficit disorders and hyperactivity that he suffered from in high school as well.

I know that the Government, in its sentencing memo, has made the argument that, well, he never got — he never followed through on any of the treatments that he was ordered or was prescribed to take, and, therefore, to rely on that as a basis for a variance is inappropriate, Your Honor, and I disagree. I think that misconceives the nature of the mental health diagnoses that my client suffers from.

It is not something like an uncontrolled -like a controllable addiction, like perhaps cannabis use or
other ones that are -- that are not of an opiate nature, where
you can say, all right, I'm going to rationally decide I'm
going to go to the treatment, and then I'm going to get better
and move on from this time in my life.

The mental health diagnoses that he has received from the doctors that have evaluated him are very serious and go to the heart of one's ability to regularly attend that mental health treatment.

Well, the circumstances of this case are unfortunate, and his incarceration and the sentence that the Court will impose today will generally be a punishment to Mr. -- to Mr. Bretz, Your Honor. But there is a silver lining, if one could find it in circumstances like this, where he will be in the Federal Bureau of Prisons system.

Thereafter, he will be on supervision for a period of time, an extended period of time, where there are far more resources,

care, and attention paid to criminal defendants like

Mr. Bretz, who suffer from these kinds of disorders, that will
allow him to get the treatment and have a member of this
probation office be on him to make sure that he attends those
treatments. And if he doesn't, he will be before Your Honor,
and the Court will be able to have that level of supervision
on him that otherwise prior to this, based on his non-serious
criminal history, he simply just never had.

Your Honor, he understands that he needs to take treatment very seriously as he goes forward in life or he will forever be held back and haunted by these -- these mental health issues that he suffers from. But I believe that the -- being now in the federal system will give him the best opportunity for that.

And I think Your Honor, to the extent my client's activities and behavior in this case were in any way related to those mental health issues, the Court can take just some modicum of comfort that those issues will be addressed in his supervision and in the Bureau of Prisons, and that there should be less concern, as in other cases where mental health issues are less prevalent, that recidivism will be of less concern in this case.

Your Honor, I know that the Government, with respect to one of my early arguments, says that the criminal history score doesn't account for my client's juvenile record.

But the guidelines recognize that juvenile records should not count if they are not close enough in time and certainly of not a serious nature. And, once again, much similar to the three convictions my client sustained as an adult, they are for criminal mischief, trespass; things that -- you know, that reflect deviance and delinquency, but just that, Your Honor.

And so I don't think that in any way undercuts the argument that seven points substantially -- substantially overcounts the nature of his criminal history.

Your Honor, my client has never been in this kind of trouble before. There are no allegations that he has ever caused any physical harm to an individual in his presence in his life. There is no allegation that he has ever forced himself on anyone, minor or adult, or committed any sort of violent crime against someone.

And I think that that is what -- that -- those concerns exist beneath the surface anytime this Court is faced with a child pornography offense, but, also, a case like this, where there is online extortive behavior.

And the Court is aware of a concept that at least I know that I have submitted to this Court before as this concept of the online disinhibition effect; that people will behave online and on social media in ways that they would not treat a person face to face; that it in some ways emboldens them, but also gets them to be separated from the

victims of their offense.

Mr. Bretz understands fully the effect that his actions have had on the individuals that he spoke to directly on Facebook, and he also understands that child pornography is the scourge of our society. And that even though he did not partake in the direct abuse of those minors, that merely by possessing and receiving that — those images, he has perpetuated that harm. He does understand that, Your Honor.

But I think given the nature of his criminal history and given the nature of the way the guidelines treat certain offense characteristics as leading to enhancements, I believe that the Court has a reasonable basis to vary down and find that a more — a more sufficient, but not greater than necessary advisory guideline range here is 78 to 97 months and find that a sentence in the upper end of that range, 90 months, is sufficient, but not greater than necessary.

That, combined with an extended period of supervised release -- at least ten years, Your Honor -- can assure the Court that Mr. Bretz would be sufficiently deterred, but, also, that the community will be protected from any potential future harm that he can inflict.

I think that a 90-month sentence would specifically deter him from ever engaging in this again. But with the supervision of the United States Probation Office and the treatment that they would require Mr. Bretz to undergo

```
while on supervision, hopefully that would address directly
 1
 2
     the issues that caused the offense in this case.
 3
                    Thank you, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Does Mr. Bretz wish to address the
 5
     Court?
               MR. LIPSON: May I have one moment to confer with my
 6
 7
     client?
               (Discussion held off the record.)
 8
               MR. BRETZ: Your Honor.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Yes.
11
               MR. BRETZ: I'd like to say that I am truly sorry
12
     about everything that I did. And to the people that I harmed,
13
     I'd like to say sorry. Especially to my family, especially to
14
     the victims. And I'd like to say sorry to the Court because
     of taking up your time. Honestly, I kind of look forward to
15
16
     getting the help that I need, because I know I need it.
17
                    That's all.
18
               THE COURT: Mr. Trabold.
               MR. TRABOLD: Your Honor, I would submit to you that
19
20
     when you look at the 3553 factors in this case, none of them
2.1
     are in this Defendant's favor.
22
                    The nature and circumstances of this offense
23
     clearly are not in his favor. This is a Defendant that's
24
     spent a considerable amount of time collecting child
25
     pornography.
```

I don't need to go over with Your Honor how terrible that is, but, really, we call it child pornography, but, really, they are crime scene photos. They are pictures of little kids being raped. There's no — there's no other way you can really describe them.

This Defendant, when interviewed by the FBI, revealed that he masturbated to material that the average

This Defendant, when interviewed by the FBI, revealed that he masturbated to material that the average human being completely recoils when they get even the slightest look at it.

Additionally, Your Honor, and one of the things that's very troubling to me about this case, when we looked at the content of his computer, he had videos on the computer clearly taken from his house of a little girl walking home from school past the front of his house. It's highly concerning to me that he took those videos — not only that he took them, but that he kept them. He took it upon himself to videotape a girl walking home from school more than once. It's extremely troubling.

What's most troubling about the circumstances of this offense, though, are that on at least three separate occasions and by the Defendant's own estimate five separate occasions -- and, actually, he said, when asked how many times he had engaged in sextortion online, he actually said a "shit-ton".

This Defendant -- and there's no other way --

there's no other way around it. This Defendant terrorized multiple women into providing him what he wanted.

And what's odd about it, and what is troubling to me, is he recorded significant portions of that terror that he engaged in. And you -- when we looked at the computer, you can see exactly what it is that he did to these -- on what -- one of them was a minor at the time. And it's our belief, although we could never really identify who the other two girls were, that those girls were young adults, who weren't minors at the time, but were not -- you know, not much older than 18.

But you can -- you can see him interact with these women online, because he records the entire interaction. And you can see their -- their reaction as he begins to ratchet up his behavior and increase his threatening language and his threatening behavior. You can start to see them break down emotionally and begin -- at the end, prior to them giving him what he wants, they -- they end up begging him not to do what it is he's doing. In response to that begging, in response to the -- essentially, the request for mercy, he ratchets up his language and makes it even more threatening.

He recorded these interactions. And I would submit to you that the only reason he recorded the interactions is because he wanted to enjoy them over and over and over again. Unfortunately for him, recording them

basically resulted in him recording criminal activity over and over again.

The first interaction that's reported by the authorities in Colorado is extremely concerning, because he actually extorts this girl while she's in high school, in the school, and he tells her to go to the bathroom in the school and provide him what he wants, and she actually does it while she's there.

So to call the situation "unfortunate", to call it "difficult", it is really a dramatic oversimplification.

It's way more than unfortunate, and it's way more than difficult. This is a Defendant that showed no mercy to the victims as he terrorized them over and over again.

And he comes into court today and asks for a downward variance because his criminal history isn't that bad, he claims. Well, that ignores the fact that he got no points for his juvenile adjudications, it ignores the fact that he began his activity when he was 15, it ignores the fact that on his first adult conviction, he was given the opportunity for ARD, where he would have had no points for that conviction. He would have been given ARD. Had he done what he was supposed to, that interaction with law enforcement would have resulted in no points.

But even having been given ARD, he still couldn't take advantage of that situation. He was revoked

from ARD, and then he was revoked again and got a jail sentence after he initially got probation. Still didn't learn anything from that interaction and committed multiple other offenses.

Now, did he murder people as a result of those?

No. But the fact of the matter is he has seven criminal history points, he was revoked multiple times, and he got no points for any of his juvenile adjudications. That is not an overstatement of your criminal history. And there's nothing about any of that criminal history that should give you any confidence at all that when you release him, he's going to do what either you or the probation department tell him to do.

Your Honor, when you look at the history and characteristics of this Defendant, this Defendant, unlike many of the defendants that come into court before you for sentencing, describes his upbringing as pretty normal. He had two loving parents who did the best they could to take care of him, who provided him a home, provided him the necessities of life. That is way beyond what many people come into court having experienced in their young life. He, unfortunately, didn't take advantage of those opportunities.

And he wants to point to his mental health history as somehow mitigating. I would submit to you that it is not mitigating, because one of the things that you have to do here is make an assessment as to your level of confidence

as to what this Defendant will be like when you release him back into the community.

His mental health history should not provide you a level of confidence in releasing him out into the community, for the primary reason that having been given the opportunity for treatment on multiple occasions, he did not take advantage of that. And you can't just say, well, that's because he was mentally ill. You have to look at a person's conduct. And you don't just get a pass for criminal conduct because you're mentally ill. You don't just get a downward variance because you say you have mental health history. You have to look at, well, has this person in the past done anything to address their mental health history. And he has not done anything, even though he's been given multiple opportunities.

So having done nothing to address your mental health history, you should lose the opportunity for that to be a mitigator in this case.

He's been given the opportunity for drug treatment multiple times. He's not followed through with any of that. So that should not be a basis to mitigate his sentence.

Your Honor, one of the things that's unusual about this case is we have not had a lot of these sextortion cases. We're almost kind of on the leading edge -- and I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hope -- I hope, of course, that we don't have any more of these. But this is now becoming more and more of a problem online; individuals extorting -- almost all the time it's men, of course, extorting women to provide them naked imagery. But we are kind off the leading edge of those cases, such that you're imposition of a top-end guideline sentence in this case will have a massive deterrent effect. It will send the message to the community that these things are not to be tolerated; that this is above and beyond -- way above and beyond what we will accept. Your Honor, at the end of the calculus in this case, this is a Defendant that, by his own admission, engaged in sextortion activity with -- I think he actually put a number on it of at least five. We found recordings of at least three victims. He repeatedly tells these victims, using increasingly threatening language, to do what he wants. He also admitted to the FBI that when they came into his house, he tried to hide his laptop. They ended up finding his laptop in the location where he tried to hide it. I don't doubt that this Defendant is a troubled In fact, when I looked at the content of his young man. computer, I came to the conclusion that he is an extremely troubled young man. But the question that the defense has not answered in this case is: Why is that a mitigator? To call

yourself a troubled young man, that's not mitigating. If anything, that's aggravating, because part of what you have to do again is make the assessment as to what this Defendant is going to be like when you release him.

Your Honor, one of your -- as you're well aware, having been a Judge for a very long time now -- one of your primary responsibilities is to protect the community. This is a Defendant who by his own admission is a troubled young man, who hasn't followed through on the opportunities that have been given to him for treatment, who has been revoked from probation, who hasn't followed through or taken advantage of ARD. I agree that he's a troubled young man. We are simply asking you to protect the community for as long as possible and to give him a sentence at the top end of the guideline and to place him on a term of supervised release for the rest of his life.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Will the Defendant please rise.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it's the judgment of the Court that the Defendant, Mark Bretz, is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons for a term of 96 months at count one and 24 months at counts two, three, and four, to run concurrently.

The Defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine. Therefore, a fine is not imposed.

The issue of restitution will be resolved by 1 2 separate order. 3 Upon release from imprisonment, the Defendant 4 shall be placed on a term of supervised release for a term of 5 six years at count one and one year at each of counts two, through four, with all terms to run concurrently. 6 7 Within 72 hours of release from the custody of 8 the Bureau of Prisons, the Defendant shall report to the 9 probation office in the district to which he is released. 10 While on supervision, the Defendant shall not commit another 11 federal, state, or local crime, and he shall comply with 12 standard conditions of supervision that have been recommended 13 by the Sentencing Commission and adopted by this Court. 14 He shall also comply with these additional 15 The Defendant shall not possess a firearm, conditions: 16 ammunition, destructive device, or any dangerous weapon. 17 The Defendant shall not use or possess 18 controlled substances, except those that are prescribed by a 19 licensed medical practitioner for legitimate medical purposes. 20 The Defendant shall participate in a program of 2.1 testing and, if necessary, treatment for substance abuse, as 22 directed by the probation officer, until he's released from 23 the program by the probation officer. 24 The Defendant shall submit to one drug 25 urinalysis within the first 15 days of being placed on

supervision and at least two after.

The Defendant shall contribute to the costs of drug rehabilitation in an amount to be determined by his probation officer, provided that it's reasonable and does not exceed the actual cost of the treatment.

The Defendant shall not purchase, possess, or use any substances that are designed to alter or simulate or change in any way your urine specimens, or devices designed to submit a urine specimen from another individual.

The Defendant shall participate in a program of mental health treatment and/or sex offender treatment. Again, a program approved and directed by his probation officer.

The Defendant shall abide by all program rules, requirements, and the conditions of the sex offender treatment program, including submitting to polygraph testing to determine if he's in compliance with the conditions of his supervised release.

The probation office is authorized to release the Defendant's presentence investigation report to any mental health treatment providers, if so requested.

With the exception of brief, unanticipated, and incidental contact, the Defendant shall not associate with children under the age of 18, except for family members or children in the presence of an adult who has been approved by the Defendant's probation officer.

2.1

The Defendant shall not possess or access with intent to view any materials, including pictures, photographs, books, writings, drawings, videos, or video games depicting and/or describing child pornography, as that term is defined in Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 2256(a).

In accordance with Title 18 of the United States Code, Sections 3563(a)(8), 3583(d) and 4042(c)(4) and the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act at Title 42 of the United States Code, Section 16901, the Defendant shall report the address at which he will reside and any subsequent change of address to his probation officer.

Further, the Defendant shall register as a convicted sex offender in any state in which he resides, is employed, carries on a vocation, or is a student.

The Defendant is permitted to possess and/or use a computer and is allowed access to the Internet.

However, the Defendant is not permitted to use a computer or other electronic devices, including a cell phone, to access child pornography or to communicate with any individual or group for the purpose of promoting sexual relations with children.

The Defendant shall consent to the installation of any hardware or software to monitor any computer or other electronic communication or data storage devices used by the Defendant to confirm the Defendant's compliance with this

condition. The Defendant shall consent to the periodic inspection of any such installed hardware or software to ensure that it is functioning properly. The Defendant shall pay the monitoring costs, as directed by his probation officer.

Furthermore, the Defendant shall consent to periodic, unannounced examinations by his probation officer of any of his computers, cell phones, or other electronic communication or data storage devices to which he has access, to confirm that he is in compliance with this condition.

Additionally, the Defendant shall consent to the seizure and the removal of hardware and data storage media for further analysis by the probation office based upon reasonable suspicion of a violation of the conditions of supervision or unlawful conduct by the Defendant.

The Defendant's failure to submit to the monitoring and/or the search of his computers and other electronic communication or data storage devices that he uses may be grounds to revoke his supervised release.

The Defendant shall provide the United States
Probation Office with accurate information about his entire
computer system, including all hardware and software, as well
as other electronic communication or data storage devices or
media. This shall include disclosure of all passwords that
the Defendant uses and the identity, passwords, and any

requested information about any Internet service provider that he uses.

The Defendant shall comply with all rules of the Computer Restriction and Monitoring Program.

The Defendant may use a computer in connection with any employment approved by the Defendant's probation officer and provided that the Defendant notifies the employer of the nature of his convictions. The probation officer shall confirm Defendant's compliance with this notification requirement.

The Defendant shall not enter into any rental agreement and/or purchase agreements for computers, cell phones, or electronic communication or data storage devices without the prior consent of his probation officer.

The Defendant, likewise, shall not make excessive or unexplained purchases of items ordinarily related to children under the age of 18 -- and that would be toys, clothing for children, things of that nature -- unless he gets prior approval of his probation officer.

The Defendant shall not photograph or videotape any children under the age of 18 without the written consent of their parent or legal guardian, who at the time of consent are aware of the nature of the Defendant's prior criminal history. That is, that have been made aware of it. And the Defendant's convictions. And approval of his probation

1 officer.

The Defendant shall submit his person, property, residence, vehicles, papers, place of business, and/or employment to a warrantless search conducted by the United States Probation Office, provided that the probation office has reasonable suspicion that there's contraband or evidence supporting a violation of any of these conditions of his supervised release. And, also, such a search, based upon reasonable suspicion, must take place at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

The Defendant shall advise any other residents that the premises may be searched by the probation office pursuant to this condition. Failure by the Defendant to submit to such a search may be grounds to revoke his supervised release.

Finally, the Defendant shall cooperate with his probation officer in the collection of a DNA sample, which is required by law.

The Defendant is ordered to pay a special assessment of \$400, which is due immediately, if it's not already been paid. That's not a fine. That's a special assessment. No fine is invoked; the Court making the finding that the Defendant lacks the ability to pay a fine.

The Defendant's property that's the subject of the Court's Preliminary Order dated September 13th, 2019 is

hereby forfeited to the United States. 1 2 MR. LIPSON: Your Honor, with respect to that last point, I had a discussion with counsel for the Government 3 4 about certain items that were listed in its motion for 5 criminal forfeiture, and we identified seven items which are 6 actually not subject to forfeiture, because after agents 7 reviewed, they did not contain any proceeds or were not used in relation to the offenses. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. LIPSON: I could state what those are for the 11 record, or I could speak to the Court's clerk after --12 MR. TRABOLD: I will put on the record that I have 13 spoken with counsel, and it is our plan to -- hopefully by the 14 beginning part of next week, just because the case agent is 15 out of town this week, to return the items that counsel has 16 identified to us. 17 All that happened was counsel identified the 18 items that he didn't think had contraband on them. We'll just 19 confirm that with our forensic examiner, and then those items 20 will be returned to Mr. Bretz's family, hopefully by the 21 beginning part of next week. 22 However the Court wants to handle that, 23 whatever needs to be put on the record beyond that, I'm fine 24 with, but I just wanted you to know that. 25 THE COURT: Are you satisfied with that?

MR. LIPSON: That works for Mr. Bretz, yes. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 The Court notes that the Court concurs, and 4 will -- understands that the Forfeiture Order as it currently 5 stands will have those exceptions. MR. LIPSON: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: It will be worked out between the 8 parties. 9 MR. LIPSON: Thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: In imposing the sentence, the Court has 11 considered all relevant statutory provisions, the submissions, 12 written submissions from counsel, the arguments of counsel, 13 the allocution of the Defendant, the United States Sentencing 14 Guidelines. The sentence does represent a variance from the 15 quidelines. 16 I would note with regard to that variance that 17 the Court does deem the guidelines in child pornography cases 18 to be generally overly punitive. This is represented in probably all of the sentences, if not a high percentage of the 19 20 sentences that this Court has imposed in child pornography 21 cases. 22 And I would recognize also that that's also 23 been the trend across the country and within our district; 24 that there's routinely a variance below the guidelines 25 prescribed in child pornography cases on the basis that they

appear to be overly harsh in and of themselves.

Having said that, the Court believes that the sentence imposed in this case for a total of 96 months is a substantial sentence. It is not a life sentence. It is one that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary to address the 3553 factors. It's sufficient, certainly, 96 months, to punish the Defendant for his wrongful conduct. It's sufficient to promote respect for the law. It's sufficient to deter others from engaging in similar conduct.

Eight years in federal penitentiary isn't going to deter a rational person from engaging in similar conduct? I think it does. I think it's sufficient to reflect the seriousness of this crime, which it certainly is a very serious crime. I think that the incarceration period, coupled with the six years of supervised release to follow, is a substantial period that will protect society from potential harm, as well as the period needed to rehabilitate the Defendant.

The facts of this case are disturbing. There's no question about it. What the victims went through because of the Defendant's threats to them, the circumstances surrounding the whole picture, their age, the site of where these threats were made, all into account, paints a very serious and disturbing picture.

But, again, eight years in a federal

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

penitentiary is a substantial sentence, and I believe that one longer than that, coupled with his supervised release, would be more than is necessary to address the sentencing factors set forth in the statute and factors that have been recognized from time and memorial to punish someone for their criminal activity. Mr. Bretz, you have the right to appeal and you have the right to a lawyer to represent you on appeal. If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer to represent you on appeal, one will be appointed to represent you at no cost to you. Also, if you're indigent, any other costs associated with the appeal, which would include filing fees, the cost of obtaining certified records and transcripts, that, too, would be paid for by the United States Government. You only have 14 days from the date of your sentence to file your appeal. Should you wait longer than 14 days from the date of your sentence, you lose your right to appeal. If you were to contact our court clerk and advise the clerk that you wish to appeal, the clerk would prepare a Notice of Appeal for you and file it on your behalf. Sir, do you understand your appellate rights? MR. BRETZ: Yes, I do. Is there anything else from the THE COURT: Defendant by way of the institution where he serves his

```
sentence?
 1
 2
               MR. LIPSON: One moment, Your Honor.
 3
               (Discussion held off the record.)
 4
               THE COURT: The Court would note that the Court
 5
     doesn't have jurisdiction, once sentence is imposed. However,
 6
     the Court may make recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons
 7
     regarding matters such as where he serves his sentence, the
 8
    programs that he may able to partake in, but they are only
 9
     recommendations.
10
               MR. LIPSON: Your Honor, Mr. Bretz would request
11
     that the Court could recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that
12
    he serve his sentence at a facility as close to the Erie,
13
     Pennsylvania area as possible so his family could visit him
14
     and he can hopefully see them more regularly.
15
               THE COURT: I'll make that recommendation.
16
               MR. LIPSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Is there anything else from the
     Defendant?
18
19
               MR. LIPSON: Not at this time, Your Honor.
                                                            Thank
20
     you.
2.1
               THE COURT: Anything else from the Government?
22
               MR. TRABOLD: No, sir.
23
               THE COURT: If not, we're adjourned. Thank you.
24
               (Hearing concluded at 3:27 p.m.)
25
```

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$ I, JANIS L. FERGUSON, RPR, CRR, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled case. \S\ Janis L. Ferguson JANIS L. FERGUSON, RPR, CRR \frac{10/28/2019}{Date of Certification} Official Court Reporter